



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/923,202   | 08/06/2001  | John E. McCall       | 00163.1415US01      | 8895             |
| 23552  | 7590        | 01/14/2005           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| MERCHANT & GOULD PC<br>P.O. BOX 2903<br>MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903 |             |                      | DIXON, THOMAS A     |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 3629                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/923,202

**Applicant(s)**

MCCALL, JOHN E.

**Examiner**

Thomas A. Dixon

**Art Unit**

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 and 43-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-42 and 70-79 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 and 43-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Review of the Koropitzer et al ('5,694,323) reference has necessitated the withdrawal of the indication of allowable subject matter and new rejections below.
2. Claims Directed to an Apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function, *In re Danly* 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 582, 531 (CCPA 1959).

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1657 (bd Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Thus the structural limitations of claim 14, including a data collector and an advisory module receiving the collected information are disclosed in Koropitzer et al (5,694,323) as described herein. Further, the means plus language, is not of the same scope as the method claims, and is disclosed by Koropitzer et al as seen below. Also as described the limitations of the claim do not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art.

Thus the structural limitations of claim 56, including an intelligence module, a mapping module, a storage module and a communication module are disclosed in Koropitzer et al (5,694,323) as described herein. Further, the means plus language, is not of the same scope as the method claims, and is disclosed by Koropitzer et al as seen below. Also as described the limitations of the claim do not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-12, 14-18, 20-22, 43-44, 48, 50-54, 56, 59–65, 67-68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koropitzer et al (5,694,323).

As per Claim 1.

Koropitzer et al ('323) discloses:

receiving a plurality of collected data relating to a destination facility, each of the plurality of collected data being associated with one of a plurality of data types, see column 4, lines 1-30;

generating data conclusions based on an analysis between each of the plurality of collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type of the collected data being analyzed, see column 9, lines 26-64;

mapping the data conclusions to advisory information, see column 9, lines 61-64;

storing advisory information in a storage module for subsequent access by the field service providers, see column 11, lines 42-59;

receiving a request from a specific field services provider for presentation of specific advisory information, the request comprising a provider identification code associated with the specific field service provider, see column 12, lines 34-36 and column 10, lines 4-7;

in response to receipt of the request, retrieving the specific advisory information from the storage module based on the provider identification code, see column 12, lines 32-51;

presenting the specific advisory information to the specific field services provider through the network device, see column 12, lines 44-51.

As per Claim 2, 44.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the receiving act comprises:

collecting device data associated with utility devices maintained at the destination facility, see column 4, lines 1-44;

collecting business data associated with a customer of a service providing company employing the field service provider to provide a service to the customer at the destination facility, see column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 13; and

collecting census data associated with the destination facility, see column 10, lines 1-13.

Art Unit: 3629

As per Claim 6.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses providing the specific advisory information as a script in a format based on the network device through which the specific field service provider is communicating to the computer through the network, see column 11, lines 50 – column 12, line 3.

As per Claim 8, 50.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the script is a visual format, see column 11, lines 60-64.

As per Claim 9, 51.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the script is a text format, see column 11, lines 60-64.

As per Claim 10, 52.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the specific field service provider provides a service at the destination facility based on the specific advisory information, see column 10, lines 1-7.

As per Claim 11, 53.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses:  
accessing a specific customer account record based on the provider identification code, see figure 5;  
accessing a specific data-type record of the specific customer account record based on the provider identification code, see figure 11  
retrieving the specific advisory information from the specific data-type record, see figures 6 and 7.

As per Claim 12, 54.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses:  
accessing a specific customer account record based on the customer account code, see figure 5;  
accessing a specific data-type record of the specific customer account record based on the provider identification code, see figure 11  
retrieving the specific advisory information from the specific data-type record, see figures 6 and 7.

As per Claim 14.

Koropitzer et al ('323) discloses:  
a data collector receiving collected data related to a destination facility, the collected data being associated with a data type, see column 1, lines 1-15;

Art Unit: 3629

an advisory module receiving the collected data from the data collector, generating advisory information relating the collected data to an advisory rule corresponding to the data type and presenting advisory information to a field service provider, see figure 6 (600).

As per Claim 15.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the data collector receives data associated with utility devices at the destination facility, see column 4, lines 1-44.

As per Claim 16.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses data type includes account data associated with a service being provided by the field service provider at the destination facility, see figures 6-7.

As per Claim 17.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the data collector receives data associated with a utility device and the collected data is data type from the group of device data, business data and census data, see column 4, lines 1-44.

As per Claim 18, 48.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the advisory information is in the form of a script in a format based on the network device through which the field service provider is connected to the advisory module, see figures 6-7.

As per Claim 20

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the script is in visual format, see figures 6-7.

As per Claim 21

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the script is in textual format, see figures 6-7.

As per Claim 22

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses:  
an intelligence module retrieving the stored data from the database and generating a data conclusion relating to the retrieved data to an advisory rule corresponding to a data type, see column 34 lines 12-18;  
a mapping module mapping the data conclusion to advisory information, see figure 6.

As per Claim 43.

Koropitzer et al ('323) discloses:

Art Unit: 3629

receiving a plurality of collected data relating to a destination facility, each of the plurality of collected data being associated with one of a plurality of data types, see column 4, lines 1-30;

generating data conclusions based on an analysis between each of the plurality of collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type of the collected data being analyzed, see column 9, lines 26-64;

mapping the data conclusions to advisory information, see column 9, lines 61-64;

storing advisory information in a storage module for subsequent access by the field service providers, see column 11, lines 42-59;

receiving a request from a specific field services provider for presentation of specific advisory information, the request comprising a provider identification code associated with the specific field service provider, see column 12, lines 34-36 and column 10, lines 4-7;

in response to receipt of the request, retrieving the specific advisory information from the storage module based on the provider identification code, see column 12, lines 32-51;

presenting the specific advisory information to the specific field services provider through the network device, see column 12, lines 44-51.

As per Claim 56.

Koropitser et al ('323) discloses:

an intelligence module retrieving stored data and generating a plurality of data conclusions relating to stored data to advisory rules, see figure 6 (600);

a mapping module mapping each of the generated data conclusions to an advisory information data structure, see figure 3 (302);

a storage module storing each of the advisory information data structures mapped to a generated data conclusion in association with the destination facility identifier, see figure 3 (307);

a communication interface operable to communicate with users over a communication network and receiving, in a request by a first user to access the network advisory, a provider identification code associated with the first user, the communication interface determining that the first user is authorized to access advisory information data structures associated with the first destination facility based on a mapping of the provider identification code to the destination facility identifier and consequently transmitting the advisory information data structures associated with the first destination facility to a first network device for presentation to a first user, see figure 3 (303).

As per Claims 59..

Koropitser et al ('323) further discloses the first user is authorized to access advisory information data structures associated with a plurality of destination facilities each being identified by a destination facility identifier, see figures 6 and 16.

As per Claims 60.

Art Unit: 3629

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the first user is authorized to access advisory information data structures associated with a plurality of destination facility identifier, see figures 6 and 16.

As per Claims 61.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the storage module comprises a plurality of customer account records, see figure 17.

As per Claims 62

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses a customer account record comprises a device data-type operable for storing, see figure 6 and 17 and account data type record operable for storing advisory information, see figure 16 and 17.

As per Claims 63.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses at least one account data-type record is a business data-type record operable for storing advisory information data structures derived from business data associated with the customer account, see figure 17.

As per Claims 64.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses at least one account data type record is a census data-type record operable for storing advisory information data structures derived from census data associated with the customer account, see figure 17.

As per Claims 65.

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the data structures in the form of a script, see figure 6.

As per Claims 67

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the script is an audio/visual format, see figure 6.

As per Claims 68

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses the script is in a textual form, see figure 6.

As per Claims 69

Koropitzer et al ('323) further discloses a land based network, see column 13, lines 36-41.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:



Art Unit: 3629

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 26, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al (5,694,323) in view of Durston et al (4,707,848).

As per Claims 4, 26, 57.

Koropitzer et al ('323) does not specifically disclose transmitting advisory information to the field service provider as the field service provider is in transit between a first destination facility and a second destination facility.

Durston et al ('848) teaches providing off-duty communications with a central office without technician intervention, which is seen to be between a first destination facility and a second destination facility, see abstract, for the benefit of allowing the field service provider to go directly to the next destination without checking back in to the headquarters for new assignments.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transmit information to the field service provider between a first destination and a second destination as taught by Durston et al ('848) for the benefit of allowing the field service provider to go directly to the next destination without checking back in to the headquarters for new assignments.

5. Claims 3, 23-25, 45, 47, 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al (5,694,323) in view of Wakefield (5,961,561).

As per Claim 3, 23, 45.

Koropitzer et al ('323) does not disclose a wireless network.

Wakefield ('561) teaches transmitting advisory information to the field service provider via the wireless interface module, see figure 1, column 6, lines 14-49 for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transmit the advisory data wirelessly for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

As per Claim 24, 47.

Koropitzer et al ('323) does not disclose a wireless telephone.

Wakefield ('561) teaches transmitting advisory information to the field service provider via the wireless interface module, see figure 1, column 6, lines 14-49 for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

Art Unit: 3629

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transmit the advisory data wirelessly for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

As per Claim 25.

Koropitser et al ('323) does not disclose a wireless computing device.

Wakefield ('561) teaches transmitting advisory information to the field service provider via the wireless interface module, see figure 1, column 6, lines 14-49 for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transmit the advisory data wirelessly for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

As per Claim 58.

Koropitser et al ('323) does not disclose a wireless network

Wakefield ('561) teaches transmitting advisory information to the field service provider via the wireless interface module, see figure 1, column 6, lines 14-49 for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transmit the advisory data wirelessly for the benefit of enabling a technician to analyze the error code and take necessary steps to eliminate the error code.

6. Claims 4, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitser et al (5,694,323) in view of Wakefield (5,961,561) further in view of Durston et al (4,707,848).

As per Claims 4, 46.

Koropitser et al ('323) does not specifically disclose transmitting advisory information to the field service provider as the field service provider is in transit between a first destination facility and a second destination facility.

Durston et al ('848) teaches providing off-duty communications with a central office without technician intervention, which is seen to be between a first destination facility and a second destination facility, see abstract, for the benefit of allowing the field service provider to go directly to the next destination without checking back in to the headquarters for new assignments.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transmit information to the field service provider between a first destination and a second destination as taught by Durston et al ('848) for

Art Unit: 3629

the benefit of allowing the field service provider to go directly to the next destination without checking back in to the headquarters for new assignments.

7. Claims 5, 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al (5,694,323) in view of Wakefield (5,961,561) further in view of Durston et al (4,707,848) further in view of Ziegra et al (5,619,183).

As per Claims 5, 49.

Koropitzer et al ('323) does not disclose the advisory is audio.

Ziegra et al ('183) teaches text audio and video links for the operator to review, see column 8, lines 32-45 for the benefit of offering the technician information in multiple formats.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to send an audio advisory as taught by Ziegra et al ('183) in the invention of Koropitzer et al ('323) for the benefit of offering the technician information in multiple formats.

8. Claims 7, 19, 45, 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al ('323) in view of Ziegra et al (5,619,183).

As per Claims 7, 19, 45, 66.

Koropitzer et al ('323) does not disclose the advisory is audio.

Ziegra et al ('183) teaches text audio and video links for the operator to review, see column 8, lines 32-45 for the benefit of offering the technician information in multiple formats.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to send an audio advisory as taught by Ziegra et al ('183) in the invention of Koropitzer et al ('323) for the benefit of offering the technician information in multiple formats.

9. Claims 13, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al ('323) in view of Walker et al (5,963,911).

As per Claims 13, 55.

Koropitzer et al ('323) does not disclose assigning technicians based on specialty codes.

Walker et al ('911) teaches assigning technicians based on specialty codes. for the benefit of increased customer service by assigning a qualified technician to do the job, see column 7, lines 11-59.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to assign technicians based on skills as taught by walker

Art Unit: 3629

et al for the benefit of increased customer service by assigning a qualified technician to do the job.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Dixon whose telephone number is (703) 305-4645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thomas A. Dixon  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3629

January 05